



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,601	01/26/2005	Akira Imai	4034-64	3444
23117	7590	08/23/2006	[REDACTED]	EXAMINER
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC				CHUNG, DAVID Y
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			[REDACTED]	ART UNIT
ARLINGTON, VA 22203				PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/522,601	IMAI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Y. Chung	2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,5-7 and 9-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2-4 and 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>25 July 2005</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takamatsu et al. (JP 03-230699).

As to claim 1, Takamatsu discloses a stereoscopic color liquid crystal display.

Note in figure 4, substrate 48, parallax barrier 36, and color filter layer 31. The parallax barrier 36 has a predetermined pattern on one side of substrate 48 and the color filter layer is formed on the other side of substrate 48 with a prescribed positional relationship to the parallax barrier.

As to claim 13, Takamatsu discloses a stereoscopic color liquid crystal display.

Note in figure 4, substrate 48, parallax barrier 36, and color filter layer 31. The parallax barrier 36 has a predetermined pattern on one side of substrate 48 and the color filter layer is formed on the other side of substrate 48 with a prescribed positional relationship to the parallax barrier. Note also the second substrate 47 and the display medium 30 between the substrates.

As to claim 14, Takamatsu discloses a stereoscopic color liquid crystal display.

Note in figure 4, substrate 48, parallax barrier 36, and color filter layer 31. The parallax barrier 36 has a predetermined pattern on the side of the viewer as denoted by 34L and 34R. Note also the second substrate 47 and the display medium 30 between the substrates.

As to claim 5, the parallax barrier disclosed by Takamatsu is made of a metallic material.

As to claim 6, the first layer is considered to be color filter layer 31.

As to claim 9, Takamatsu shows in figure 4 that the substrate with the parallax barrier is secured to substrate 47 with a predetermined gap into which the liquid crystal display medium is formed.

As to claim 11, the display medium 30 shown in figure 4 is a liquid crystal layer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 7, 10, 12 and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takamatsu et al. (JP 03-230699).

As to claim 7, Takamatsu does not disclose a black matrix in figure 4. However, it was well known and obvious to form a black matrix as part of the color filter layer in order to prevent light leakage. This in turn allowed the display to maintain an acceptable contrast ratio. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to form a black matrix as the first layer in order to maintain good contrast ratio.

As to claim 10, Takamatsu does not disclose dividing the panel into a plurality of smaller panels. However, this was a common and conventional practice since forming multiple panels at once was much more efficient. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to form multiple panels because of the increase in efficiency.

As to claims 12 and 15, Takamatsu does not disclose forming a polarizer on the viewer side of the first substrate. However, it was well known and obvious to do this since it was necessary for display purposes to allow only polarized light to pass through the display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2871

the time of invention to provide a polarizer on the viewer side of the first substrate because it was necessary for display purposes.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-4 and 8 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of Takamatsu did not disclose forming an alignment mark of any kind. It does not seem that this would have been an obvious modification to Takamatsu as there does not seem to have been any purpose or motivation to provide one in the device of Takamatsu.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Chung whose telephone number is (571) 272-2288. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday 9:30 am to 6:00 pm.

David Chung
GAU 2871
08/21/06



DUNG T. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER